



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,852	11/27/2006	Noboru Ichinose	PHKF-05004US	3677
21254 7590 02/10/2009 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817				
EXAMINER				
WHALEN, DANIEL B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2829				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/10/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/589,852

**Applicant(s)**

ICHINOSE ET AL.

**Examiner**

DANIEL WHALEN

**Art Unit**

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 8 and 14-27 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 8, 16-27 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/18/08, 10/20/08  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 22-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harwig et al. ("Electrical Properties of  $\beta$ -Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Single Crystals. II,"; hereinafter "Harwig").

3. **Re Claims 22 and 23**, Harwig teaches a method of controlling a conductivity of a Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, comprising:

adding (doping) a predetermined dopant to the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal ( $\beta$ -Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> single crystal) such that said dopant is substituted for Ga in the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal to obtain a desired conductivity (page 205, Introduction line 1-15, Experimental line 1-13),

wherein said predetermined dopant comprises a p-type dopant (Mg; also applies to **claim 23** for p-type dopant) for controlling a conductivity of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, said p-type dopant comprising one of H, Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs, Fr, Be, Mg, Ca, Sr, Ba, Ra, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Pd, Cu, Ag, Au, Zn, Cd, Hg, Tl, and Pb, said conductivity of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal being controlled dependently on an adding amount of said p-type dopant (fig. 1; page 205, introduction line 1-15, experimental line 1-13).

Wherein said desired conductivity is dependent upon an amount of said predetermined dopant added to said  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal (fig. 1).

It is noted that one of the ordinary skill in the art would recognize that when the predetermined dopant such as p-type dopant (Mg) is doped to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal, the dopant is substituted for Ga in the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal. Furthermore, the recitation of "said dopant is substituted for Ga in the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal" is only a statement of the inherent properties of adding the dopant (e.g. Mg) to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal. The structure recited in Harwig is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. Or where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. See *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977) and MPEP 2112.01.

Furthermore, regarding the recitation of conductivity that is dependent upon an amount of the predetermined dopant added to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system, Harwig shows Mg 1000 and Mg 100 are showing different conductivities at the same temperature. Therefore, Harwig clearly teaches that the conductivity is dependent upon an amount of the predetermined dopant added to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system. Additionally, even if Harwig does not explicitly disclose the conductivity dependency with the amount of dopant, one skilled in the semiconductor art would easily recognize that the concentration of either n-type dopant or p-type dopant is directly proportional to the conductivity of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$ .

system. Therefore, as the concentration of dopant varies, the concentration that dopant is implanted also varies.

**Re Claim 24**, Harwig teaches that said n-type dopant (Zr) comprises one of Si, Hf, Ge, Sn, Ti, and Zr.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwig in view of Harwig et al. ("Electrical Properties of  $\beta$ -Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Single Crystals. II,"; hereinafter "Harwig").

6. **Re Claims 16 and 17**, Harwig teaches a method of controlling a conductivity of a Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, comprising:

adding (doping) a predetermined dopant to the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal ( $\beta$ -Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> single crystal) such that said dopant is substituted for Ga in the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal to obtain a desired conductivity (page 205, Introduction line 1-15, Experimental line 1-13),

wherein said predetermined dopant comprises a p-type dopant (Mg; also applies to **claim 17** for p-type dopant) for controlling a conductivity of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, said p-type dopant comprising one of H, Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs, Fr, Be, Mg, Ca, Sr,

Ba, Ra, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Pd, Cu, Ag, Au, Zn, Cd, Hg, Tl, and Pb, said conductivity of the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal being controlled dependently on an adding amount of said p-type dopant (fig. 1; page 205, introduction line 1-15, experimental line 1-13).

It is noted that one of the ordinary skill in the art would recognize that when the predetermined dopant such as p-type dopant (Mg) is doped to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal, the dopant is substituted for Ga in the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal.

Furthermore, the recitation of "said dopant is substituted for Ga in the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal" is only a statement of the inherent properties of adding the dopant (e.g. Mg) to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal. The structure recited in Harwig is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. Or where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. See *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977) and MPEP 2112.01.

Although Harwig discloses the purity of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal is 4N (pg. 205, Experiment, Alusuisse 99.99%), Harwig does not explicitly disclose that the purity of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal is 6N. Nevertheless, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that 6N of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  is more pure than 4N of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  by optimizing the gas flow and therefore 6N has an improved electrical property by having less impurity in the system compared to 4N of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$ . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system to have the purity of 6N over 4N for improved electrical property with less impurity in the system.

**Re Claim 18**, Harwig teaches that said n-type dopant (Zr) comprises one of Si, Hf, Ge, Sn, Ti, and Zr.

7. **Claims 1, 4, and 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwig in view of Ueda et al. ("Synthesis and control of conductivity of ultraviolet transmitting  $\beta$ -Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Single Crystal"; hereinafter "Ueda").

8. **Re Claim 1**, Harwig teaches a method of controlling a conductivity of a Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, comprising:

Adding (doping) a predetermined dopant to the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal such that said dopant is substituted for Ga in the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal to obtain a desired conductivity (page 205, introduction line 1-15, experimental line 1-13),

wherein said predetermined dopant comprises one of:

a n-type dopant (Zr) for decreasing a resistance of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, said conductivity of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal being controlled dependently on an adding amount of said n-type dopant (fig. 1; page 205, introduction line 1-15, experimental line 1-13); and

a p-type dopant (Mg) for increasing a resistance of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal, said conductivity of the Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> system single crystal being controlled dependently on an adding amount of said p-type dopant (fig. 1; page 205, introduction line 1-15, experimental line 1-13).

However, Harwig does not disclose that the predetermined dopant comprises one of: the n-type dopant comprising one of Si, Hf, Ge, Sn, and Ti; and the p-type

dopant comprising one of H, Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs, Fr, Be, Ca, Sr, Ba, Ra, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Pd, Cu, Ag, Au, Zn, Cd, Hg, Tl, and Pb. Ueda discloses adding the dopants such as Sn to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  single crystal to control the conductivity (page 1361). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Harwig with that of Ueda as Sn as readily available n-type dopant to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  single crystal.

It is noted that one of the ordinary skill in the art would recognize that when the predetermined dopant such as n-type dopant (Zr) or p-type dopant (Mg) is doped to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal, the dopant is substituted for Ga in the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal. Furthermore, the recitation of "said dopant is substituted for Ga in the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal" is only a statement of the inherent properties of adding the dopant (e.g. Zr/Mg) to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal. The structure recited in Harwig is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent. Or where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. See *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977) and MPEP 2112.01.

Although Harwig discloses the purity of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal is 4N (pg. 205, Experiment, Alusuisse 99.99%), Harwig does not explicitly disclose that the purity of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal is 6N. Nevertheless, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that 6N of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  is more pure than 4N of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  by optimizing the gas flow



and therefore 6N has an improved electrical property by having less impurity in the system compared to 4N of  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$ . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system to have the purity of 6N over 4N for improved electrical property with less impurity in the system.

**Re Claims 4 and 5**, teaching of Harwig and Ueda has been discussed above. However, the combined teaching is silent as to describing numerical values of the resistivity and a carrier concentration. It is noted that the combined teaching teaches an identical process, such as doping a predetermined dopant to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal, and an identical material, such as n-type dopant. Therefore, a value of  $2.0 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $8.0 \times 10^{-2} \Omega\text{cm}$  as the desired resistivity by adding the n-type dopant and a carrier concentration within a range of  $5.5 \times 10^{15}$  to  $2.0 \times 10^{19} \Omega\text{cm}$  are obtained. MPEP 2112.01.

Furthermore, applicant should note that it has held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

9. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwig and Ueda as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ichinose et al. (US 2004/0007708 A1; hereinafter "Ichinose").

**Re Claim 8**, teaching of Harwig and Ueda has been discussed above including controlling the electrical conductivity of the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal. However, although Harwig discloses doping Mg as the p-type dopant (Introduction), the combined

teaching does not explicitly disclose p-type dopant comprising one of H, Li, Na, K, Rb, Cs, Fr, Be, Ca, Sr, Ba, Ra, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Pd, Cu, Ag, Au, Zn, Cd, Hg, Tl, and Pb. Ichinose discloses adding the p-type dopant such as zinc (Zn) to  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  single crystal (page 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Harwig and Ueda regarding controlling the resistivity (resistivity is simply the reciprocal of its conductivity) with that of Ichinose regarding doping p-type dopant such as Zn as it is readily available p-type dopant material choice to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  single crystal to obtain the desired resistivity. It is noted that the combined teaching of Harwig, Ueda, and Ichinose teaches an identical process, such as doping the predetermined dopant to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal, and an identical material, such as the p-type dopant. Therefore, a value of  $1 \times 10^3 \Omega\text{cm}$  or more as the desired resistivity by adding the p-type dopant are obtained. MPEP 2112.01.

Furthermore, applicant should note that it has held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

10. **Claims 19-21 and 25-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harwig.

**Re Claims 19-21 and 25-27**, teaching of Harwig has been discussed above. However, Harwig is silent as to describing numerical values of the resistivity and a carrier concentration. It is noted that Harwig teaches an identical process, such as

doping a predetermined dopant to the  $\text{Ga}_2\text{O}_3$  system single crystal, and an identical material, such as n-type dopant and the p-type dopant. Therefore, a value of  $2.0 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $8.0 \times 10^2 \Omega\text{cm}$  as the desired resistivity by adding the n-type dopant, a carrier concentration within a range of  $5.5 \times 10^{15}$  to  $2.0 \times 10^{19} \Omega\text{cm}$ , and  $1 \times 10^3 \Omega\text{cm}$  or more as the desired resistivity for adding p-type dopant are obtained. MPEP 2112.01.

Furthermore, applicant should note that it has held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as set forth above in the Office Action.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL WHALEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30am to 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. W./

Application/Control Number: 10/589,852

Page 12

Art Unit: 2829

Examiner, Art Unit 2829

01/28/2009

Daniel Whalen

/Michael S. Lebentritt/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2829